1851 Exhibition Science Research Scholarship 1906, 1907, 1914-5

352

EXHIBITION OF 1851 ROYAL COMMISSIONERS

54 Victoria Street
S.W.

25th June 1906.

Dear Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 15th inst. with reference to the nomination of Mr. R. H. Clark & to inform you that your letter will be submitted for consideration by the Scholarships Committee of the Royal Commission at their next meeting

I am.
Yours faithfully
Evelyn Shaw
Asst Secy.

To James London Hoff LL.D.
President of the University of Toronto.

KERR, DAVIDSON, PATERSON & McFARLAND,
BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS &c.
J.K.KERR, K.C. W.DAVIDSON
JOHN.A.PATERSON, K.C. G.F.McFARLAND, LL.B.
TELEPHONE MAIN 608.
CABLE ADDRESS "KERDASON" TORONTO.
"KERRDASON"
23 ADELAIDE ST. EAST. (COR. VICTORIA ST.)

Toronto, November 20th 1906

21.11.06

James Brebner, Esq., M.A.,
Registrar, University of Toronto,
Toronto.

My Dear Mr. Brebner:-

I am much obliged to you for your letter of the 15th instant, enclosing to me, as directed by the President, a copy of a letter recently received from the Assistant Secretary of the Royal Commissioners for the Exhibition of 1851 with reference to No. 7 of the regulations regarding the Science and Research Scholarships.

This letter forms a useful addition to the opinions and documents upon this much discussed problem which have been accumulating since last May. It is a marvellous thing to me that the opinions and recommendations of the Royal Commissioners appear to possess so little consistency, at least to men like myself, of only ordinary intelligence and finite mind. It would be a great help to the peacefulness of this academic discussion if the Commissioners would remain of the same opinion for more than a few weeks at a time. The language of Shakespeare, Newton, Addison and Lord Mansfield surely ought to be able to clearly express an ordinary idea so that a wayfaring man, even though a fool, might not be mislead. But it seems not. There must be some truth in that oft-quoted satire that "language is meant not to express thought, but to conceal thought".

You will remember that last spring the meaning of this much discussed seventh regulation was referred by the Senate to a Committee of five, and it, by a majority of four to one, was of opinion that the term "Student" in the seventh regulation was to be read as

KERR, DAVIDSON, PATERSON & McFARLAND,
BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS &c.
J.K.KERR, K.C. W.DAVIDSON.
JOHN A. PATERSON, K.C. G.F.McFARLAND, L.L.B.
TELEPHONE MAIN 608.
CABLE ADDRESS "KERDASON" TORONTO.
"KERRDASON"
23 ADELAIDE ST. EAST. (COR. VICTORIA ST.)

Toronto, ... 190

"meaning Undergraduate Student, and that to be eligible the candidate "must have been an Undergraduate Student of the institution by which "he is nominated either for the last full year prior to his nomination "or for a full year ending within twelve months prior to the time of "his nomination, and in the latter case must also, since ceasing to be "an Undergraduate Student, have been engaged solely in scientific "study. It plainly follows that in the latter case the time which is "to elapse between the candidate ceasing to be an Undergraduate "Student and his nomination must be something less, certainly not more "than twelve months", which meant that a ~~candidate~~ graduate of more than one year's standing was ineligible, and Mr. Dawes, who graduated in 1904, was declared ineligible for the competition in 1906.

Thereafter, in answer to a letter addressed to the Royal Commissioners by ex-President Loudon, with reference to the seventh regulation, the Royal Commissioners, on the 18th of May, 1906, stated that "a Graduate Student who graduated in June, 1904, will not be eligible, being a Graduate of more than one year's standing". That is for the competition of 1906,- and this they said in the face of the fact that in about 50 cases out of 138 reported, the Commissioners had accepted Graduates of more than one year's standing,- and upon that Mr. Dawes was disqualified.

Then followed certain regulations prepared by the Committee of five, which were believed at that time to reflect the meaning of the Royal Commissioners as far as they could be understood, and these regulations, inter alia, stated that "a Graduate of more than one year's standing is not eligible".

KERR, DAVIDSON, PATERSON & McFARLAND,
BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS &c.
J.K.KERR, K.C. W.DAVIDSON.
JOHN A. PATERSON, K.C. G.F.McFARLAND, LL.B.
"KERRDASON"
23 ADELAIDE ST. EAST. (COR. VICTORIA ST.)
TELEPHONE MAIN 608.
CABLE ADDRESS "KERDASON" TORONTO.

Toronto, 190

J.B., -3-

Now the next thing we have is this letter dated the 1st of November, 1906, a copy of which you have sent me, and there I find it stated - "The candidate shall be eligible for a Scholarship "provided (1) that he has spent the last full academic year immediate-"ly prior to the time of nomination as a Student in any Faculty or "Scientific Department of that institution by which he is nominated, or "(2) that he has been a Student of such institution for a full "academic year ending within twelve months prior to the time of "nomination, and since ceasing to be a Student of that institution has "been engaged solely in scientific study. The word "Student" in the "preceding statement must be understood as comprehending ~~any~~ one engaged in Under-"graduate or Post-Graduate work".

In other words, a "Student" may be an Undergraduate or a Graduate. If he is a Graduate, then a Graduate of two years' standing would be clearly within this their last interpretation of this regulation, provided that that Graduate had (1) spent the last full academic year immediately prior to the time of nomination as a Student Graduate in any Faculty or Scientific Department of that institution by which he is nominated, or as in (2) above. By that explanation, Mr.Dawes was eligible. I understand, of course, that this is not a new regulation, but an explanation of their standing printed regulation No. 7. Mr. Dawes was engaged in research work, and ~~not~~ as a Laboratory Assistant.

If the Commissioners intended to exclude a Graduate of more than one year's standing, it would have been so easy in their last

KERR, DAVIDSON, PATERSON & McFARLAND,
BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS &c.
J.K.KERR, K.C. W.DAVIDSON.
JOHN.A.PATERSON, K.C. G.F.McFARLAND, LL.B.
"KERRDASON"
TELEPHONE MAIN 608.
CABLE ADDRESS "KERDASON" TORONTO.
23 ADELAIDE ST. EAST. (COR. VICTORIA ST.)

Toronto, 190

bulletin to have stated it concretely, but you will notice that they did not.

I do not think it is possible for anyone to lay down some consistent line of interpretation, having all the documents issued by the Royal Commissioners before them. These emanations out-rival ~~led~~ in ~~obscurity~~ obscurity the far-famed Delphic oracle, which was such a convenience to Priests of that memorable fane.

I am not so concerned with this discussion as a mere piece of dialectics; it is the practical issue that I am looking at. If other institutions send their Graduates of two or three years' standing, within the meaning of this regulation,- and they have done it in the past,- and we in Toronto are limited to men of one year's standing, we will be out-distanced in the struggle for supremacy. We cannot do ourselves justice, and as our University has now under the present Government and its Board of Governors taken upon itself larger powers and opportunities for doing greater work, why should we, under the interpretation as was understood last May, be prevented from sending to England the best men we have? That, to my mind, is a serious question. I would suggest that the Commissioners be asked why it was that they sent us that memorandum of the 1st of November, and to point out to them the apparent inconsistency, and to remind them that they have very frequently in the past accepted Graduates of more than ~~of~~ one year's standing for this Scholarship. Is it possible that the reason of their sending to our University this explanation was that they repented of the answers they gave to President Loudon last

KERR, DAVIDSON, PATERSON & McFARLAND,
BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS &c.
J.K. KERR, K.C. W. DAVIDSON.
JOHN A. PATERSON, K.C. G.F. McFARLAND, LL.B.

TELEPHONE MAIN 608.
CABLE ADDRESS "KERDASON" TORONTO.
"KERDASON"
23 ADELAIDE ST. EAST. (COR. VICTORIA ST.)

Toronto, 190

J.B., -5-

May? If they meant that, why did they not explicitly say so?

As the President directed you to send me a copy of this last interpretation, I write this so that the President may make any use of it that he thinks best.

Yours very truly,

John A. Paterson

ADDRESS REPLY TO
JAMES BREBNER,
REGISTRAR.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

13th April, 1907.

The President.
University of Toronto.

Dear Sir:-

I send you herewith copies of various documents dealing with the 1851 Scholarship:

(1) The report submitted by the Senate's Committee with reference to the petition from Mr. Clark;

(2) The statement from the President submitted in the first place to the University Council and subsequently submitted to the Senate;

(3) The latest communication from the Commissioners.

Yours very truly,

James Brebner

L.S. Registrar.

54 Victoria Street,
Westminster, London, S.W.
1st November, 1906.

Sir,

The Royal Commissioners for the Exhibition of 1851 have carefully considered the interpretation of the General Regulations controlling their Scholarships and I am now diredted by them to communicate the following explanatory statements with special reference to No 7 of the General Regulations.

The Candidate shall be eligible for a scholarship provided (1) that he has spent the last full academic year immediately prior to the time of nomination as a student in any faculty or scientific department of that institution by which he is nominated, or (2) that he has been a student of such institution for a full academic year ending within twelve months prior to the time of nomination and since ceasing to be a student of that institution has been engaged solely in scientific study.

The word "student" in the preceding statement must be understood as comprehending one engaged in undergraduate or post-graduate work.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
(Sgd.) Evelyn Shaw,
Assistant Secretary.

The President,
The University,
Toronto,
Canada.

54 Victoria Street, Westminster,
London, S.W.
18th May, 1906.

Sir,

With further reference to your letter of the 4th instant, the questions in which have been answered by my telegram of 17th instant, I am now diredted to explain more fully in the order given to your questions:

That

No. 1. An undergraduate student who will pass his examination for B.A. or B.A. Sc. in May and receive his degree on June 8th 1906 will be eligible for nomination this year; but the Commissioners would make the appointment conditional upon his receiving such degree.

No. 2. A graduate student who graduated in June 1905 will be eligible.

No. 3. A graduate student who graduated in June 1904 will <u>not</u> be eligible, being a graduate of more than one year's standing.

No. 4. A graduate student who graduated in June 1903 will <u>not</u> be eligible for the same reason as given to No. 3.

No. 5. A graduate student who is also a laboratory assistant will be eligible in so far as he is a graduate of not more than one year's standing.

No. 6 A candidate is eligible who has devoted himself during the academic year to research work; the nature of his occupation during the vacation would not prejudice his position.

No. 7. A "full year" in first line of No. 7 of General Regulations means an academic year .

To satisfy your request for a definite and final interpretation of No 7 of the General Regulations I have been directed to give you the foregoing answers to your seven questions.

At the same time I am to point out that the Commissioners reserve to themselves the right of interpreting the meaning of their regulations, in case of doubt or difficulty arising, as these were drafted merely for the general guidance of the authorities of the institutions invited to recommend candidates.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the object of these scholarships is to secure the best talent, and assist, by the suitable equipment of promising scholars, the furtherance of scientific work. And it is also necessary to remember that the responsibility of selection lies with the authorities of the nominating institution.

I am Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Evelyn Shaw.

The President,

University, Toronto.

To the Senate of the University of Toronto:

The Committee appointed to consider and report as to the action to be taken upon the petition of Robert H.Clark and other graduates and undergraduates of the University complaining of the nomination made for the year 1906 by the University Council for the 1851 Exhibition Scholarship, beg leave to report as follows:

Your Committee requested the attendance at their meeting of a representative or representatives of the University Council. They were informed that the Council had decided not to send a representative but it placed all its records at your Committee's disposal.

Your Committee are unable to agree in the conclusion of the University Council that Mr. Dawes is under the terms of the general regulations of the Commissioners respecting the 1851 Exhibition Scholarship eligible for nomination in the year 1906.

They are also unable to agree with the view that under the regulations an undergraduate student in science who has completed his course of study leading to his degree but has not yet obtained it is not eligible for nomination.

Your Committee agree with the Council in thinking that the regulations are somewhat difficult of interpretation, but after full consideration have reached the conclusion that their scope and meaning are reasonably clear.

It may be premised that it is not open to question that the students referred to in the regulations are students of Science in a University or College and those only.

Having regard to the conditions existing in England when the regulations were framed, the motive for founding the Scholarships and the language of the regulations

your Committee are of opinion that the terms "student" and "students" do not include those taking post-graduate courses or pursuing post-graduate studies.

It is to be observed that no where in the regulations is it stated that the candidate must at the time of his nomination actually have obtained a degree. He must have been for three years a bona fide student of science in a University or College in which special attention is given to scientific study (regulation 3). The purpose of the Scholarship is by regulation I declared to be to enable students who have passed through a college curriculum and have given distinct evidence of capacity for original research to continue the prosecution of science with the view of aiding its advance or its application to the industries of the country.

Regulation 7 provides that:

"The candidate must have been for the last full year prior to the time of his nomination a student of the institution by which he is nominated to must have been a student of such institution for a full year ending within twelve months prior to the time of nomination and since ceasing to be such student have been engaged solely in scientific study.

Reading this regulation in the light of the other regulations to which reference has been made, your Committee are of opinion that the term "student" is to be read as meaning undergraduate student and that to be eligible the candidate must have been an undergraduate student of the institution by which he is nominated either for the last full year prior to his nomination or for a full year ending within twelve months prior to the time of his nomination and in the latter case must also since ceasing to be an undergraduate student have been engaged solely in scientific study. It plainly follows that in the latter case the time which is to elapse between the candidates ceasing to be an undergraduate student and his nomination must be

something less, certainly not more, than twelve months.

Accepting this as the proper test of eligibility Mr. Dawes was not and the candidates Bowman, Daly and Marshall were eligible.

The Commissioners have expressed the opinion that a candidate if otherwise eligible is not disqualified because during the year in which he is required to be engaged solely in scientific study he has occupied the position of demonstrator.

Your Committee while not dissenting from that view are of opinion that it is not desirable that a member of the teaching staff of the University, by which the nomination is made, should compete with undergraduate candidates or candidates who do not occupy such positions.

Your Committee are of opinion that in fairness to those desiring to become candidates for the scholarship it is highly desirable that an authoritative declaration should be made of what are the qualifications necessary to entitle to nomination and would strongly recommend that before the next competition takes place a clear definition should be made of what those qualifications are and that if thought desirable communication should be had with the Commissioners, in order to obtain their consent to the definition which is proposed to be given.

As to the nomination for 1906, your Committee recommend that the University Council be informed of the conclusion which has been reached and be requested to reconsider their nomination.

That the right of making the nomination is vested in the Senate as the academic governing body of the University does not appear to your Committee to be open to doubt.

The Council which has acted in the past, not being the governing body of the University, has acted only as

the delegate of the Senate, ~~which~~ with which rests the ultimate responsibility for the nomination ~~an~~ which is made and which has in the opinion of your Committee the undoubted right to intervene and to prevent any nomination of which it does not approve from being sent forward as the nomination of the governing body of the University, as well as to put an end to the delegated authority by virtue of which the Council acts in the matter.

Your Committee have dealt with the question as one of construction of the regulations, and they do not in any manner question or impugn the judgment of the Council with regard to the scholastic qualifications of the various candidates.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) W. R. Meredith.
Chairman.

358

COPY.

June 2nd, 19[illegible].

To the Secretary to the Navy(?),

I am directed to transmit to you for the information of [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] regarding the death of the late [illegible], and to state that the [illegible] were [illegible] adopted by the Council at a meeting held May 31st.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) [illegible].

Manuscript of an thesis by the University

Cannon, Jonathan Ian and Jonathan Ian Cannon.

University of Toronto,
May 31st, 1966.

MEMORIALS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL REGARDING THE 1921 EXHIBITION SCHOLARSHIP.

At a meeting of the University Council held on 5th April the report of the committee previously appointed to recommend a candidate for the 1921 Exhibition Scholarship was received. Annexed to the report was the opinion of the University Solicitor regarding the eligibility of candidates under the printed regulations of the Commissioners. Acting in accordance with the opinion of the Solicitor as to the eligibility of candidates and in accordance with the ranking of the Committee of the Council as to order of merit, the Council decided to nominate Mr. H. T. Dawe for the Scholarship.

Subsequently to this meeting, the matter was brought to the attention of the University Senate by a petition from a number of the candidates. After consideration, the Senate adopted and forwarded to the Council a report dealing chiefly with the questions of the construction of the regulations as to the eligibility of candidates, and requesting the Council at the same time to reconsider its resolution. On these points the ruling of the Senate is substantially as follows:-

A. AS TO JURISDICTION:

(1) "That it is not open to doubt that the right of making the nomination is vested in the Senate as the academic governing body of the University.

(2) That, in the past, the Council has acted in this matter only as the delegate of the Senate, and that consequently the Senate has a right to intervene to prevent any nomination not approved by it from being sent forward, as well as to put an end to the delegated authority by virtue of which the Council acts in the matter.

3. AS TO ELIGIBILITY OF CANDIDATES:

(1) The Senate finds that the term "student" and "students" in the printed regulations of the Commissioners do not include those taking postgraduate studies.

(2) The Senate finds that undergraduates about to graduate are eligible for nomination, which agrees with the position always taken by the University Council on this point.

(3) The Senate differs from the University Council as to the eligibility of Mr. Dames.

(4) Whilst stating that Messrs. Bowen, Daly and Marshall are eligible, the Senate omits to express an opinion as to the eligibility of Messrs. Clark and Stewart.

The report of the Senate and the accompanying request for re-consideration were brought before the Council at a meeting held on the 30th April, when on discussion, the Council, after deciding to request the Commissioners for permission to postpone nomination for a month, adjourned to afford further time for consideration and inquiry.

Referring to the report of the Senate, I think it proper to point out in the first place that, in my opinion, the Senate is laboring under a misconception regarding its jurisdiction in this matter. As one of the governing bodies of the University, the Council is undoubtedly competent to act in the nomination of candidates for the 1851 Exhibition Scholarship, in the same way in which, for instance, it acts regarding the nomination of candidates for the Rhodes Scholarship. Moreover, neither the records of the Senate nor those of the Council show any such delegation of authority in the matter as is assumed in the minutes of the Senate;

and furthermore, the original letters from the Secretary of the Commission, Major General Ellis to the President of University College, and from the Chairman of the Commission, Sir Lyon Playfair to Sir Daniel Wilson make it perfectly clear that it was expressly intended by the Commissioners to put the nomination of candidates into the hands of the University Council as representing the teaching side of the University.

The letter from Sir Lyon Playfair was as follows:-

10 September, 1890.
Nahant, Mass.

Dear Sir Daniel:

You may, on my authority, strike out the words "University College" and substitute "University of Toronto" for the Scholarship.

The fact is two forms were sent to me from London, one being for the College, the other for the University of Toronto and I was authorised by the Royal Commissioners to forward either at my option. I wished to attach the scholarship to the teaching body and so sent you the form with "University College" and destroyed the other form containing the words "University of Toronto". There is therefore full authority for making the change as you desire. As I have just ceased being the Executive Commissioner, the Royal Commission naturally look to me for advice on all questions of this kind.

.....

Yours truly,

(Sgd) Lyon Playfair.

Subsequently to the Council meeting of 30th April, and in accordance with the understanding arrived at on the point, I communicated the Senate report to the University Solicitor, and asked him whether he still adhered to his former opinion as to eligibility of candidates. In a letter, which is appended, he maintains his original position and states that if a graduate of two years' standing or upwards is ineligible, the Commissioners must have agreed between 30 and 50 times out of 1[illegible]. He points out also that if the opinion expressed in the Senate report is correct, it would prejudice the reputation and prestige of this University in case graduates of more than one year's standing were appointed by the Commissioners from other Universities, as has been the practice, and not from the University of Toronto.

Being thus confronted with two contradictory legal opinions, I considered it my duty to communicate immediately with the Commissioners, instead of waiting for some future occasion as was suggested in the report of the Senate. In doing so I have endeavored to cover completely all the points in dispute, as may be seen from the following letter:

May 4th, 1908.

Major General Ellis,

24 Victoria Street,

Westminster, London.

Sir:-

On the 1st inst. I despatched a cablegram to you requesting a postponement for one month in the date of nominating a candidate from this University for the 1851 Exhibition Scholarship. I am writing you now to explain my reasons for making this request, and to bring to the attention of the Commissioners certain difficulties which have arisen in connection with the matter.

Although the printed regulations of the Royal Commission appear to speak reasonably clear in their application, nevertheless in proceeding to make a nomination on this occasion, differences of opinion have arisen here, both among individual members of the staff and between different academic bodies, as to the interpretation of certain parts of the regulations.

Under the circumstances I have thought it best to ask for the postponement already referred to, and, in the meantime to request the decision of the Commission on certain questions, viz. I shall state below. In order, however, to make the bearing of the questions as clear as possible, I shall state some facts which may be necessary to an understanding of local conditions. With regard to the questions themselves, I hope I shall be pardoned for including some which might naturally be thought unnecessary upon a careful perusal of the general regulations, but as a matter of fact the diversity of opinion to which I have referred is so considerable, that owing to the different interpretations assigned by various persons here to the word "student" in the regulations, some hold that only undergraduate students are eligible, while others hold that only graduate students are eligible. Hence, I have felt it expedient to include in the questions some points which under other circumstances I should have omitted.

The students of science in this University belong either to the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Applied Science, and they are either undergraduate or graduate students.

An undergraduate student in the Faculty of Arts or of Applied Science is one who is proceeding to the degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Applied Science respectively, the course in each case extending over a period of

four years, the collegiate session in the B.A. course extending in each year from 1st October to about the end of May, and in the B.A.Sc. course over a slightly shorter period.

A graduate student is one who is simply engaged in investigation under the direction of a professor, or one who, having obtained the Bachelor's degree, is proceeding to the degree of M.A. or Ph.D. It should be stated that in the University of Toronto the degree of B.A. with honors and the degree of Ph.D. are given only upon the [illegible] of an approved research, the minimum length of course for the former degree being one year, and for the latter two years. I should explain also that the regulations of the University permit a man to be a graduate student, as above described, and at the same time a [illegible] assistant or [illegible], and that the work of the graduate student may be carried on during the final twelve months of the year.

In view of the fact that some existing [illegible] are required and [illegible] on any 1st or any given year, I think it will be [illegible] that our examinations for B.A. and B.A.Sc. take place in May and that the [illegible] are [illegible] about the 8th of June.

Taking May 1st, 1906, as the [illegible] of [illegible] for candidates of the following classes, who are to be understood as having [illegible] the [illegible] regulations of the Foundations for [illegible] [illegible], I beg to submit the following questions as to eligibility of candidates, the [illegible] student and graduate student being understood in the sense defined above:

1. Is an undergraduate student, who will pass his examinations for B.A. or B.A.Sc. in May, and receive his degree on June 8th, 1906, eligible for nomination?

2. Is a graduate student, who graduated B.A. or B.A.Sc. in June, 1905, eligible?

3. Is a graduate student, who graduated B.A. or B.A.Sc. in June, 1904, eligible?

4. Is a graduate student, who graduated B.A. or B.A.Sc. in June, 1907, eligible?

5. In cases mentioned in questions 2, 3 and 4 above, is a graduate student, who is also a laboratory assistant, eligible?

6. Is a candidate eligible, who has engaged in commercial employment during the four months of vacation (June to September 1905), and who for the following seven months was engaged in research work in the University?

7. Does the expression "full year" in the first line of Pg. 7 of the General Regulations mean "a period of twelve calendar months"?

As the matter is somewhat urgent, I beg to request the favour of an early answer by cable, at our expense; to be followed up by letter in case it is deemed necessary. In order to facilitate answer by cable I have endeavored to construct the question in such a manner that it will suffice, in your cablegram, simply to quote the questions by number with the addition of the single word "yes" or "no", as the case may be.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd) J. Loudon.

In answer to this letter I received the following cablegram and letter.

President Loudon
University, Toronto.

Loudon.

1 yes 2 yes 3 no 4 no 5 yes 6 yes 7 no letter follows

Evelyn Shaw.

[illegible] Pimlico Street, [illegible],
London, S.W.
[illegible] May, 1[illegible].

[illegible],

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

At the same time I am to point out that the Commissioners reserve to themselves the right of interpreting the meaning of their regulations, in case of doubt or difficulty arising, as these were drafted merely for the general guidance of the authorities of the institutions invited to recommend candidates.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the object of these scholarships is to secure the best talent, and assist, by the suitable equipment of promising scholars, the furtherance of scientific work. And it is also necessary to remember that the responsibility of selection lies with the authorities of the nominating institution.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

President, (Sgd.) Evelyn Shaw.

University, Toronto.

In view of the foregoing answer of the Commissioners which must be taken as decisive in the present conjuncture I would recommend that the matter of nominating a candidate be re-opened.

(Signed) J. London.

Nov 31, 19[illegible].

To the Senate of the University of Toronto,

Gentlemen:

The Board appointed by the Senate to take a nomination of a candidate for the 1601 Exhibition Science Research Scholarship beg to report as follows.

There were present:

The Chancellor of the University
The President of the University
Hon. Mr. Featherstone Osler
Hon. Mr. Justice Maclaren
Dr. Burwash
and Dr. J. A. Morrell.

The Committee considered carefully reports presented to it with regard to three theses that had been submitted in competition for the Scholarship.

Mr. J. H. Cotton submitted a thesis entitled "Multiple Astatic Rectangular Field Galvanometers".

Mr. A. R. Veleco submitted a thesis entitled "On the Mercury Green Line = 5461 A.U. resolved by Glass and Quartz Lumer Plates and on its Zeeman Components" in which he had the co-operation of Professor J. C. McLennan. In support of his candidature he also submitted an article from the "Philosophical Magazine" for October 1913 entitled "Measurements on the Earth's Penetrating Radiation with a Wulf Electrometer", and in addition two Mathematical Notes entitled "The Proof of the Electro-Magnetic Equation H cos ∂ = 4 " and "The Representation of Magnetic Moments".

Mr. H. B. Sifton submitted a thesis entitled "Some Features in the Anatomy of the Cycads and their Bearing on the Phylogeny of the Conifers", the work for the thesis having been done in the Botanical Department of the University with the advice of Professor R. B. Thomson.

Evidence was also submitted as to the academic careers of the candidates and Professors J. C. Velannan and R. B. Thomson were heard as to the qualifications and work of the candidates in their respective departments.

After careful consideration it was resolved to nominate Mr. A. R. Weiss for the 1881 Scholarship, but in view of the fact that Mr. H. B. Sifton's thesis and work are of such a high quality the Committee unanimously urge upon the Senate to recommend to the Board of Governors that a special scholarship of the same value be awarded to Mr. H. B. Sifton to be held for two years.

April 24th, 1914. Chairman.

415

December 1st, 1914

Evelyn Shaw, Esq.,

Royal Commissioners Exhibition of 1851,

64 Victoria Street, London.

Dear Sir:

To-day I have received your letter of the 7th of November addressed to the Registrar of the University in which you inform us that the Commissioners are unwilling to reconsider their decision with regard to appointing Mr. Nelson to one of the science research scholarships. I regret that the Commissioners have been unable to look more favourably upon our nomination.

The last paragraph of your letter, however, contains a statement that causes me a great deal of concern. You state that it has been unofficially reported to the Commissioners that it is possible that the information contained in the nomination form is misleading and incorrect. I cannot understand this. Would you be good enough to let me know the source of your information? If it has come from a member of our University staff, I will at once communicate with him and endeavour to discover what grounds he has for holding such a view. I think that you yourself will recognise that the only honourable method of procedure would have been for such an one to lay his views before me first and to approach you through the official channel. The accusation is so serious that in justice to this University the matter should be cleared up at the earliest possible date.

Yours sincerely,

54, Victoria Street,

Private.

London, S.W.,

4th January, 1915.

THE PRESIDENT,
The University,
Toronto.

Dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for your letter of 1st December which I have only just received on my return to dhties.

In order to explain more fully the paragraph you refer to in my last letter to the Registrar, I enclose for your own information copy of correspondence I had with Sir J.J. Thomson. I think you will realise from this correspondence that the Commissioners were justified in their letter of 7th November in calling your attention to the suggestion that the candidate's proposal for future work may have been incorrectly described.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

Secretary.

Enclos.

COPY.

Holmleigh,
West Road,
Cambridge.
October 1st, 1914.

THE SECRETARY,
The Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851,
54, Victoria Street,
London, S.W.

Dear Sir,

I have just received a letter from Professor McClennan of Toronto University about Mr. McLeod who was nominated by Toronto University for an 1851 Scholarship but whose nomination was not favourably considered by the Commissioners. Mr. McLeod is, I believe, an exceptionally able student, but from what McClennan says in his letter I think it is possible that he has not made his intentions at all clear in his application. I have not seen this, but I should think from what the Professor says it is possible that he may have given the impression that he was going to devote the time he held the Scholarship to the study of Mathematics and not to research in Physics. I gather that this was not the case, that his intention was to take up Physics during the tenure of his Scholarship and that his Mathematical Studies were for the purpose of making him better prepared for his Physical work. At any rate, I feel convinced from McClennan's letter that he would be prepared to begin Physics at once.

Perhaps I am quite wrong in attributing his rejection to the cause I have stated, if so will you excuse me, I thought it would be a pity if an exceptionally

godd man lost his opportunity through a misunderstanding.

Yours very truly,

(sgd) J.J. THOMSON.

COPY.

Cavendish Laboratory,
Cambridge,
October 5th, 1914.

THE SECRETARY,
The Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851,
54, Victoria Street,
London, S.W.

Dear Sir,

I thank you foryour letter and am sorry to have given you so much trouble. The application of Mr. McLeod was very stupidly worded and I think quite explains the action of the Commissioners. I understand, however, that in spite of the clumsiness he has shown on this occasion, he is a very good man as far as Physics is concerned.

Yours very sincerely,

(sgd) J.J. THOMSON.

COPY.

54, Victoria Street,
London, S.W.,
3rd October, 1914.

SIR J.J. THOMSON,
Holmleigh,
West Road,
Cambridge.

Dear Sir,

I am obliged to you for your letter of 1st inst. with regard to the case of this years Candidate for a Science Research Scholarship from the University of Toronto. As the matter is under the consideration of my Committee, I am unable to give you an authoritative answer to your question, but as far as I remember, and after looking up the Papers again, the reason why a Bursary was offered to Mr. McLeod was because he proposed, in the words of the official nomination, "to devote himself to the study of Higher Mathematics preparatory to Research in Physics".

It was, I assume, the intention of my Committee to allow the Candidate to continue his mathematical studies for a year at the University of Toronto, at the end of which time they would, subject to the usual conditions, offer hima Scholarship which would enable him to engage in Physical Research at Harvard University.

As I am writing this quite privately, I should like to add that my Committee in considering nominations can only examine the information put before them. It is not the first time that we have disappointed a nominating body, but as you will readily understand the Committee

which gives its most serious attention to its duties, is not likely to commit a grave error of judgment except through the withholding of proper information by the nominating authority, and for this my Committee cannot be held responsible.

I am,

Yours truly,

(sgd) EVELYN SHAW

Secretary.

January 27th, 1915

Evelyn Shaw, Esq.,

Secretary, Exhibition 1851 Royal Commissioners,

54 Victoria Street, London.

Dear Sir:

I am obliged to you for your letter with enclosures from Sir J. J. Thomson which explain the last paragraph of your former letter. I am glad to note from your letter to Sir J. J. Thomson of October 3rd, a copy of which you have been good enough to send me, that you write,-

"It was, I assume, the intention of my Committee to allow the candidate to continue his mathematical studies for a year at the University of Toronto, at the end of which time they would, subject to the usual conditions, offer him a Scholarship which would enable him to engage in Physical Research at Harvard University."

I hope therefore that Mr. McLeod will be granted a Scholarship next spring, and I feel confident from what I have discovered as to his ability and previous work here that he will prove himself worthy of the award.

Yours sincerely,

President.